DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 646 SO 008 994

AUTHOR Lybarger, Michael
TITLE Origins and Rationale of the Early Social Studies Curriculum: 1900-1916. Draft.
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Atlanta, Georgia, November 25-29, 1975); Some parts may not reproduce clearly due to marginal quality of original

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Civics; *Curriculum Development; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; History Instruction; Social Sciences; *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an historical perspective on social studies curriculum development from 1900 to 1916. The author's main purpose in tracing the originals and rationale of social studies during these years is to locate the educational thought that resulted in the creation of the social studies in its societal context. The paper discusses specific civics and social studies curricula, reports from the Social Studies Committee of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE), and early social studies textbooks. The paper focuses on the committee's recommendations about the problems of democracy and the history courses. It is concluded that, in contrast to the situation of social studies education today, the demand for social efficiency upon the development of social studies in its formative years was immediate and significant. The report recommends that school personnel make a more concentrated effort to consider their work in an historical context. References are included. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121646

SP008 994

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Lybarger
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ORIGINS AND RATIONALE OF THE EARLY SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM:1900-1916

A Paper Presented to the

College and University Faculty Assembly

of the

National Council for the Social Studies

Atlanta, Georgia

November 25, 1975

Michael B. Lybarger
Department of History
Edgewood College
Madison, Wisconsin

DRAFT: Please do not quote or reproduce without permission.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The research for this paper was begun during a leave of absence irom Edgewood College. I am grateiul to Sister Cecilia Carey and the Administrative Council of the College for making the leave possible.

It has been my privilege to discuss different aspects of this paper with Professor Michael W. Apple, Edward A. Krug and Thomas Popkewitz of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction of the University of Wisconsin. These men have been most helpful. Finally, my colleagues at Edgewood College, especially Professors D. James Guilfoil and Esther Heffernan, have manifested their friendship toward me with critical comments.

Naturally, I alone am responsible for whatever ambiguities and inaccuracies remaining in this paper.

Errata

Page 2
line 12-read "privilege" for "priviledge"

Page 3
line 8-read "C.R.S.E." for "C.S.R.E."

Page 4
line 24-insert "Education" after "Secondary"

Page 16
line 21-insert () around (thus making him)

Page 19
line 24-read "low" for "law"

Page 29
note 65-read " The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict" for "Conflict and the Hidden Curriculum".

Origins and Rationale
of the Early Social Studies Curriculum
1900-1916

In this paper, I would like to discuss the preliminary results of my research into three questions. First, where and when did that area of the curriculum we call the social studies originate? Second, what subject matter comprised the early social studies and how and why was it selected? Third, what role did the first social studies courses play in the education of children? These are, of course, rather commonsense historical questions. In endeavouring to answer them we run the risk of accepting what Marx called the "illusions of an epoch," or our subjects' commonsense appraisal of the situation in which they found themselves.[1] To avoid this, it is necessary that the historian go beyond the questions of "who", "what" and "why" about the development of the social studies. We must seek to locate the educational thought that resulted in the creation of the social studies in its societal context. It may well be that the most important thing about the early social studies curriculum was not that it included more sociology than history. Rather, the most important thing about that curriculum might be the knowledge of the social order it embodied along with the social action it legitimated.

Recent research in the sociology of education suggests that

historians might do well to consider the social and political implications of school knowledge. Michael Young, for example, has argued that "...there exists a dialectical relationship between access to power and the opportunity to legitimize certain dominant catagories, and the processes by which the availability of such catagories to some groups enables them to assert power and control over others."[2] If Young's research is anywhere near the mark, then the historian should consider other questions about the development of the social studies. Among these should be questions like: What counted as social studies knowledge? Whose knowledge was it? Whose claim to power and priviledge did this knowledge advance?

It is unfortunate that school folk in general; teachers, administrators, methods professors, curriculum workers, et. al., do not have a tradition of considering their work in its historical context. This situation is especially ironic in regard to the social studies. As educators, we are engaged in the teaching of history, political science, or sociology; or we are involved in the endeavour to teach others how to teach these disciplines None the less, we all too often fail to appropriate the insights which our disciplines afford into our activities. We generally see our problems as choices of programs (for example, MARCOS or an S.R.A kit) or as methodological choices (for example "inquiry" or "skills" teaching). If Young's contention is even partly correct, it can be seen that these choices are not neutral. Rather, they involve

important ethical and moral problems. One way to begin to understand the dimensions of these problems is to consider the history of the early development of the social studies.

The social studies first entered the school curriculum as a result of the recommendations of the Social Studies Committee of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. (C.R.S.E.). The final report of the Social Studies Committee was one of the most successful produced by the C.S.R.E. Many of the recommendations in the report--especially those calling for the development of courses in Problems of Democracy and Community Civics--were widely discussed and adopted.[3] While the Social Studies Committee did not advocate any reduction in the amount of history taught in the schools, it did make recommendations about the areas history courses should cover, which had the effect of reducing the number of history courses available to students. Moreover, the committee suggested criteria for the selection of topics in history which resulted in a significant change in orientation for school history. For these reasons this paper will focus upon the committee's recommendations about the Problems of Democracy and the history courses.

The above is not to argue that the Social Studies Committee worked a revolution in the school curriculum in 1916. Neither social studies nor Problems of Democracy were entirely new ideas. In many respects what the committee did was bring together a number of ideas and advocate certain practices which were then current in education. These ideas and practices reflected what

many persons (both in the educational field and outside of it) thought constituted appropriate schooling.

The chairman of the Social Studies Committee, Thomas Jesse Jones of the United States Bureau of Education is generally considered to be the first person to use the term "social studies" to refer collectively to history economics and civics.[4] Jones' career before joining the committee was interesting and varied. A Welsh immigrant, Jones studied at Union Theological Seminary where he received a B.D. From Union he went to Columbia University where he took a PhD in sociology under Franklin Giddings, a pioneer American sociologist. Upon graduation, Jones directed the Columbia University Settlement House until he joined the staff of Hampton Institute in 1905. At Hampton, Jones was first an instructor and then in 1906, the director of the department of research. In 1908, Jones joined the United States Bureau of Education as a "Specialist in Negro Education."[5] Five years later, still at the Bureau of Education, Jones was selected by Clarence Kingsley, the Chairman of the C.R.S.E. to chair the Committee on the Social Studies.[6]

The Social Studies Committee under Jones' direction met and corresponded frequently during its three year existence. The Committee produced three documents: A Preliminary Statement[7] by Jones in 1914, a report on The Teaching of Community Civics[8] in 1915, and a final report The Social Studies in Secondary[9] in 1916. These documents taken collectively present both the

rationale and suggested content of what one member of the committee, J. Lynn Barnard, called in 1916 "The New Social Studies."

With the exception of the report on the teaching of community civics, the committee did not make recommendations about the content of any course of study; nor did the committee outline in detail what it thought a good history or economics course might look like Rather, the Social Studies Committee saw its task as the formulation of principals "as these are derived from an apparently clear and definite trend in actual practice."[10] Several social studies programs were cited by the committee as especially illustrative of what it felt should become standard practice The committee was especially impressed with the program Jones worked in while at Hampton Institute In speaking of the possible directions the Problems of Democracy course should take the committee asserted: " We have found no better illustration of the organisation of economic and sociological knowledge on a problem basis, and of the selection of problems for study with direct reference to the pupils' immediate interests and needs than that offered in the work of this institution "[11] In view of the Social Studies Committee's commendation of the Hampton social studies course, and considering Jones' role both on the committee and in the Hampton Social Studies program, it might be well to consider the Hampton program in some detail. Fortunately, this is possible because in 1905 and 1906 Jones published a series of articles in the Southern Workman which outlined in detail the purposes, content, and goals of the Hampton social

studies program. These articles were subsequently collected and published by the Hampton Institute Press as a pamphlet entitled Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum.

Social Studies at Hampton Institute sought to meet what Jones called the "actual needs of students." Apparently, needs were perceived, not by the Hampton students, but by their teachers. Jones and his colleagues viewed Hampton students (who were either Blacks or Indians) as being suddenly transported from an earlier, more primitive, society into a complex industrial one without the requisite time for development. Consequently, Jones, argued, "These young races are utterly lacking in any ideals of home, school, church or state." Hence, it was necessary that Hampton have a social studies program which took "special precautions to supply a knowledge of the habits and ideas of civilization."[12]

Implicit in the justification for the social studies at Hampton is the Darwinian (or Spencerian) concept of evolution as this is applied to social and racial development. As this evolutionary thought existed in 1905, it held that White Anglo-Saxon society represented the highest possible stage of race development; one to which all other races ought to aspire.[13]

The evolutionary assumptions in the Hampton social studies curriculum also served a political function. It allowed Jones and his colleagues to apprehend the position and status of their students as the consequences of the working out of the natural scientific laws of evolution. Thus, the role of the dominant society in creating and defining the problems of Indians and Blacks is obscured. The social and political ambience-

Indians and Blacks is hidden. The social and political arrangements of the dominant society (which confine Blacks and Indians to second class status) are legitimated not through power; rather they are legitimated as the result of the slow unfolding of natural scientific laws. Given the vision of society which Jones and his colleagues held, the notion of social studies being selected in relation to the "needs" of students becomes more clear. The needs of students were determined in terms of the student's future role in society, which in turn was established by the stage of development at which his race found itself. An examination of the Hampton civics course will demonstrate the interconnection between "need" and evolutionary development.

The civics course at Hampton had three parts: the development of government, the function of government, and the machinery of government. The amount of time and the emphasis given each part, was determined by the "needs" of Hampton students. In teaching his students about the origins of government, Jones accepted W.E.B. DuBois' statement that "Local government in the south is a Chinese puzzle to the average citizen, and the Negro sees it only in its repressive and harrying functions, and he is allowed to take no part in it."[14] Jones used DuBois' statement to illustrate that Hampton students needed to learn that "government is evolutionary and arises either from mutual consent or conquest." Both consent or conquest are, according to Jones "natural" and subject to scientific understanding.

In a word, the origin and development of government is what we would call an objective process.[15]

Once Hampton students saw that government was the result of and subject to natural laws, Jones thought they would also understand its arbitrary manifestations in their lives in a different perspective. Students would see that things like Jim Crow laws would "in the course of time disappear, leaving government to evolve into a true democracy." Knowing this, Jones thought, would "...increase the student's hope and faith in the salutary power of democracy."[16]

The development of government section of the Hampton civics course served - perhaps unconsciously - another purpose: the fostering of political quiescence in the students. The view of government as evolutionary and tending ultimately toward greater democracy might serve to insure that Hampton students did not become either incensed about the indignities forced upon them by the southern society, or unduly assertive about their constitutional rights. Indeed, Jones hoped that the Hampton student of the social studies, "Instead of regarding the difficulties of his race as the oppression of the weaker by the stronger, [would] interpret them as the natural difficulties which almost every race has been compelled to overcome in its upward movement."[17]

The largest part of the civics course at Hampton dealt not with the development of government, but rather with those "activities of government which most directly touch the student's life." If DuBois thought that Blacks saw only the "repressive

and harrying" aspects of government, Jones sought to correct this by having Hampton students study those activities of government which "contribute directly to the public welfare." This study constituted two-thirds of the Hampton civics course.[18]

In determining the aspects of government which most directly touched his students lives, Jones considered that most Hampton students would become either farmers or the wives of farmers. Consequently, the civics course focused upon the work of the Department of Agriculture. Indeed, each of the 12 bureaus of that department was considered individually.[19] This approach, however, would help to insure that Hampton students would not be aware of the role of local and state government in contributing to their difficulties.

By focusing upon the work of the government in promoting good farming, Jones was also assuming that Blacks in the south would remain farmers. He was, probably unconsciously, accepting the division of labor as it existed then in the south as an appropriate one. Indeed, long after he had left Hampton and joined the United States Bureau of Education as a "Specialist in Negro Education," Jones continued to see education for Blacks in terms of training for farming. In his 1912 report to the Commissioner of Education on "Progress in Negro Education," Jones called for more agricultural training for Blacks. In support of this request, Jones quoted a letter from W.K.Tait, the state elementary supervisor of South Carolina. The state-

ment is worth quoting at length because it represents Jones' view of appropriate education at about the time he was preparing to join the Social Studies Committee.

> The Negro has been and will be for years to come the tenant farmer of South Carolina. His welfare and the prosperity of the White race depend upon his efficiency as a farmer. I believe we should adapt the school to the the special needs of the negro farmer and endeavour to teach him agriculture, cooking, sewing and cleanliness. thus securing for him a better existence and for the landowner a more constant labor supply. (Emphasis mine)[20]

This focus upon the role of government in contributing to the "public welfare" in the Hampton social studies served not only the welfare of Black tenant farmers but also that of their landlords. Who was best served by this emphasis is perhaps best left to the judgment of the reader.

The final element in the civics course at Hampton was a consideration of the "machinery of government." This Jones felt was the "least important" part of the course.[21] This section of the course consisted of a survey of the organisation and function of federal, state, and local governments and a consideration of voting and the nature and uses of taxation. One of the principle facts stressed in this section of the civics course was that "...since the end of the Civil War, the White people of the South have voluntarily paid out $60,000,000 in taxes for the support of negro education."[22]

The civics course was the most important component of the social studies at Hampton. Jones himself stated this, and

spent more time discussing it than all the other courses put together. Moreover, both the assumptions and content of the other social studies followed closely those of the civics course.

The economics course clearly illustrates this point. In one respect economics was easier to teach at Hampton than at other schools. Hampton students, coming from a rural, southern background had not been seduced by ".. the socialistic notions so prevelant among the working classes of the north. Consequently, Jones concluded, "the teacher has no erroneous theories of the importance of labor to explain and refute."[23]

A discussion of labor at Hampton focused instead upon the "efficiency and productivity of different races" with the students encouraged to "offer illustrations of the merits and demerits of various races." The conclusion of these discussions was apparently always the same: "As a whole, negroes have not reached the standard of the White race."[24] The other principle topics considered in the Hampton economics course are the "success of scientific agriculture in increasing productivity and overcoming the force of the law of diminishing returns," and the "great power of capital together with the self-sacrificing efforts necessary to accumulate it."[25]

Many elements in the Hampton civics course became part of The Social Studies in Secondary Education. Indeed, it often seems that the most significant changes some Hampton ideas underwent were of name and emphasis. For example, what was called "civics" at Hampton became "Civic Theory and Practice"

in Jones' Preliminary Statement. Indeed, whole paragraphs in the Preliminary Statement had first appeared in Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum.[26] "Civic Theory and Practice" in the Preliminary Statement became "Problems of Democracy" in The Social Studies in Secondary Education. Again, some of the recommendations for the "Problems of Democracy" course were a paraphrase of statements which Jones wrote in 1905 and 1906.[27]

The recommended areas of study in the Hampton Civics Course are very similar to those for the Problems of Democracy in the Social Studies in Secondary Education. In 1906, Jones argued that the Hampton social studies should focus upon "those activities of government which most directly touch the student's life and contribute directly to his Betterment."[28] In his 1913 Preliminary Statement, Jones held that "Facts, conditions, theories, and activities that do not contribute rather directly to an understanding of the methods of human betterment have no claim [for inclusion in the social studies]"[29] In 1916, The Social Studies in Secondary Education defined the social studies as "a study of all manner of social efforts to improve mankind."[30]

The reason for studying "methods of human betterment" was the same in the Hampton civics course and on the recommendations of the Social Studies Committee; namely "the immediate needs and interests" of the students. "Interest" and "need" warrant some further explanation.

One possible source of the notion of "interest" as a guide for selecting educational activities is, of course, John Dewey.

To Dewey, the notion of interest constrained the educator to "discover objects and modes of action which are connected with present powers [in order to] engage activity and carry it on more consistently and continuously."[31] As Dewey understood interest, it was that attribute of objects or activities which engaged the student's attention and evoked activity, which, as it continued, resulted in the further development and refinement of the power to do that activity or apprehend that object. Another word for "interest" in Dewey's sense might be attractive.

If Jones and his colleagues understood "interest" in the same way as Dewey, they took too narrow a view of student interests. Since most of Hampton's students came from rural communities, Jones and his colleagues assumed that the way to engage their attention would be to teach them better methods of farming. There is, however, no evidence that Jones and his colleagues sought to go beyond the conception of the Black man as a farmer. While to Dewey, interest was that element in activity which evoked further activity along its own and alternate lines, interest to Jones and his colleagues was something to be appealed to in a concrete economic sense.

The notion of interest and need as linked to occupation manifested itself in the Social Studies in Secondary Education. For example, the committee accepted James Harvey Robinson's contention that history as it was taught in the schools of 1916 did not take account of the "needs and interests" of the vast majority of high school students. "Economic and social position was

preordained to the ranks of those who do common things."[32]

Jones and his colleagues at Hampton and on the Social Studies Committee thought of the needs and interests of their students in terms of their present and probable future position in the economic order. There was however, another conception of need with which Jones must have become acquainted while at Hampton. Indeed, at the time that Jones was writing his articles for the Southern Workman, W.E.B. DuBois was articulating a different view of the ends of education. DuBois was invited to address the Hampton faculty and students during the summer of 1906. In this speech DuBois identified the "great need" of the Black race in the United States as "self-assertion in the command and use of its powers."[33] DuBuois criticized the Hampton faculty for insuring, through their educational methods, that "If young men will dream dreams [they will be] dreams of corn bread and molasses."[34]

We should not, however, assume that there was a debate at Hampton over what constituted the needs of students. Arrayed against the notion that Blacks, or indeed most students, needed anything other than a vocational education, was a most formidable segment of educational and political opinion in the United States. Theodore Roosevelt spoke to the Hampton faculty and students the day before DuBois appeared. The President of the United States was warmly applauded when he asserted that "vocational work is best for the average person of all colors," and he advised the Black student to "Hitch your wagon, not to a star, but to a mule."[35]

The "Hampton Idea" of education received sanction from people less prominent but perhaps even more powerful than President Roosevelt. It has been convincingly demonstrated that industrial education for the Blacks promised the stability which northern businessmen required for their enterprises in the south.[36] The general agent of the Peabody educational fund, J.L.M.Curry argued that a Hampton education was good insurance "against the perils of ignorance, agrarianism, nihilism, and dynamite."[37]

So far we have established the purpose of social studies at Hampton. We have also pointed to some of the political implications of the Hampton social studies. It is also possible to show that several of the more significant aspects of the Hampton program were incorporated (in some cases verbatum) into the recommendations of the Social Studies Committee of the C.R.S.E. It remains, however, to determine more precisely how this happened. There are two possible approaches to this problem. We can establish a direct connection between the work in social studies of Hampton and the work of the Social Studies Committee. Evidence for this connection may be found in the presence of Jones as the chairman of the committee and the appointment of W.A. Aery - Jones' successor at Hampton as the first secretary of the committee. No other college, university or high school in the United States saw two people associated with it serving on the Social Studies Committee. We can also establish influence in another way. It is also possible to show that the other aspects of educational and political thought in early 20th

century America created a favorable intellectual enviornment for the acceptance of the ideas and values embodied in the Hampton social studies as appropriate ones for all children in the public schools.

One area of possible influence was the attraction which the work of Hampton held for many influential persons outside the south. Some of these persons were interested in the possibility of extending the Hampton idea of education to the public schools of the north. One of the northern admirers of the work of Hampton was Albert Shaw, the editor of the influential Review of Reviews. Shaw visited Hampton in 1900 and wrote the lead article for the April issue of the Review of Reviews. In this article Shaw informed his readers that "...by all odds the finest, soundest, and most effective educational methods in use in the United States today are to be found in certain schools for negroes and Indians and in others for young criminals in reformatory prisons."[38]

Shaw's article focused mainly upon vocational education at Hampton and the fact that each element of the curriculum was designed to serve vocational education. History, for example, enabled the student at Hampton "to see the true drift of things in the United States thus making him neither despondent nor defiant...he is made to see that the White people in the South are in the main his friends and well-wishers and he is taught that it is just as fine a thing to be a farmer as it is to be president of the United States."[39]

Shaw's position was one of considerable influence among people who would have a great deal to say about the shape of American education in the first two decades of this century. The Review of Reviews was brought to the attention of David Snedden, then a young school superintendant in California.[40] (Snedden may have been the second person to use the term social studies).[41] When Snedden came to Columbia to finish his doctorate, he wrote his dissertation on the educational advantages of reform schools. The Review of Reviews was also highly regarded by Jones' major professor at Columbia,[42] Franklin H. Giddings from whom Snedden also took courses.[43] When Snedden later became Commissioner of Education for the State of Mass., one of his principle assistants was Clarence Kingsley who later became the Chairman of the C.R.S.E. and appointed Jones to the Social Studies Committee. Shaw's praise of the Hampton program could be expected to carry some weight with three of the men who were later influential in the development of the social studies curriculum.

It is possible to show that a number of the leaders in American education were attracted to the Hampton idea of education. We should also consider how the Hampton idea would appeal to school men in the north who were much less prominent than Kingsley, Snedden, or Jones. Another appeal in the Hampton approach to education lay in the possibility of using it to respond to the many critics American public education had around the turn of the century.

While Americans have been rarely pleased with the activities of their schools, criticism reached a particularly high intensity around the turn of the century. G. Stanley Hall, for example, thundered that the school curriculum made no provision for "the vast army of incapables" which had come to inhabit the schools.[44] The Bankers' Magazine viewed with alarm the fact that most of the American public schools did not offer even the rudiments of a business education.[45] Many American businessmen agreed with James P. Munroe, a New England paper manufacturer who denounced free public education as socialistic because "...it offers boys and girls wholly unfit for secondary education a temptation to exchange renumerative work at 15 years of age for the doubtful advantage of a training that can have no direct bearing upon their life, and which at the time it occurs, may do decided harm."[46] James Earl Russell of Teachers College went even further: "...no agency in the country turns more girls into the streets than our public schools."[47] Most of the critics of schools made one or more of the following points. First, the school curriculum was so dominated by college requirements that it made little or no provision for students who would never finish 12 years of public school - let alone enter college. Second, schools were neglecting to provide children with the education necessary to function in a modern society. Third, schools were not providing even the most elementary training in morality - either public or private.

In an endeavour to meet these criticisms, schoolmen sought to redefine the nature and end of education; education should be

"not for academic training, but to enable pupils to obtain practice in real life; to become socially and serviceably efficient."[48] Social efficiency, then, became the new slogan for educators. For William Chandler Bagley, social efficiency became "The standard by which the forces of education must select all the experiences which are impressed upon the individual."[49] According to David Snedden the aim of education should be "...the effective control of native propensities and instincts so as to produce...the habits, appreciations, knowledges and ideals that make the most worthwhile member of society."[50]

The impact of the demand for social efficiency upon all areas of the curriculum was profound. Many courses of study, particularly ancient languages and certain areas of mathematics, were criticized as not only irrelevant, but worthless. The demand arose that subjects either demonstrate their utility for modern living, or be abandoned as inappropriate for the masses of boys and girls in the schools. An editorial in Education was perhaps an extreme statement of this attitude: "Where does trigonometry fit in a good woman's life? Will it contribute anything towards peace, happiness, and contentment in the home? Will it bake any bread, sew any buttons, or rock any cradles?"[51]

The impact of the demand for social efficiency upon the development of social studies was immediate and significant. While history did not fall as "law" in public repute as trigonometry or Greek, there was a demand that it be made more appropriate for the needs of students. David Snedden argued that the study of history as an end in itself was for "the elect few."

(Who these "few" were neither Snedden nor anyone else seemed to know). "For most children," Snedden continued, "history must serve as instrumental to some kind of personal or social efficiency."[52] It is in the demand for social efficiency in education that we can begin to see a link between the Hampton Social Studies and the work of the Committee on the Social Studies.

Snedden's demand that history become more servicable was taken seriously by the Social Studies Committee. James Harvey Robinson, the author of The New History served on the Social Studies Committee. As early as 1911 Robinson had argued that history had to address the needs and interests of "the common man who must do common things."[53] To undertake this task the historian must ask questions like: "What is most necessary for students ...to know of the past in order for them to be as intelligent, efficient and happy as possible in the life they must lead and in the work they must do."[54] The Social Studies Committee agreed with this re-orientation of historical questions.[55]

It could be contended that Robinson and the Social Studies Committee were advocating an approach to history which might serve to enable students to understand the development of their society and hence to make intelligent decisions about their role in it. Later in the same essay, Robinson suggested that the goal of history instruction was something else. It was to enable students "...to see the significance of their humble role, to appreciate the possibilities of their own position, and to view it in as hopeful a light as circumstances will permit."[56]

History might, according to Robinson, teach the working class child to become "influential in bettering the lot of himself and his fellow workers." However, Robinson was sure that this could take place "without seriously diminishing the output."[57]

The end of "History for the Common Man" is strikingly similar to what Jones hoped would be the results of civics instruction at Hampton: " that students become more intelligent in their work, more patient under oppression, and more hopeful as to the future."[58] It may be cynical but not at all unfair to argue that Jones and Robinson and their colleagues hoped the study of history and the social sciences would enable children to appreciate but not seek to change their position in the economic and social order.[59]

It is also worth noting that while the committee quoted extensively from Robinson's The New History, they selected their quotations from only one chapter of that book. That chapter "History for the Common Man" was originally a paper entitled "The Significance of History In Industrial Education," which was first read before the Department of Superintendence of the N.E.A. in 1910.[60] The committee then was seeking to extend to all students, an approach to history which was first thought appropriate for industrial education.

The committee's acceptance of Robinson's recommendations for history courses together with the Report on the Teaching of Community Civics which was published in 1915 gives us some idea of what the committee thought was good citizenship. The good

citizen, the committee thought was a productive worker in whatever labor he found himself. What the committee defined as civic virtues, "obedience, helpfulness, courtesy, punctuality and the like," were seen as directly useful in the work children would undertake after school. J. Lynn Barnard, another member of the committee, saw the task of civics instruction as the demonstration of how these virtues were embodied in all the public and private institutions of the community. This demonstration would start with a survey of the neighborhood in the elementary school and culminate in "vocational civics" in the ninth grade.[61] Barnard asserted that the end of civics instruction was to insure that "...boys and girls would acquire a profound respect for hard work, no matter what the trade or profession followed, and a contempt only for laziness and inefficiency."[62] Students who were "more astute" would also come to see that "by far the best opportunities for service to one's fellow man, are to be found in business."[63]

This brief discussion of the early history of the social studies suggests several conclusions and raises further questions. The Social Studies, as these were understood by the Social Studies Committee in 1916, were exemplified in the curriculum of Hampton Institute. At Hampton the purpose of the social studies curriculum was to provide students with a sense of their place in society and a faith that gradually that society would become a more just one. One consequence of the Hampton social studies program--perhaps an unintended one--was to foster political quiescence in the students.

The Hampton social studies program became a model for the Problems of Democrary Course for several reasons. One was the fact that the chairman of the Social Studies Committee Thomas Jesse Jones, had been a social studies teacher at Hampton. Since this was the only teaching position Jones ever held, he may not have been acquainted with other approaches to social studies instruction.

Jones' influence, while important, was not the only reason for the incorporation of the Hampton model for the social studies into the recommendations of the Social Studies Committee. The Hampton social studies program closely reflected the dominant educational ideology of the day: social efficiency. The Hampton program appeared to answer the demand for a more practically oriented education. Incorporating, as it did, elements of vocational, civic, economic and sociological instruction, the Hampton program promised a social studies education more in tune with what were apprehended to be needs of children in an industrial society. The tendency of the Hampton program to foster political quiescence was, if anything, intensified in the program advocated by the Social Studies Committee. This is most apparent if we consider the Committee's recommendations for history and community civics.

There remain however, several other questions about the early social studies which need further research. An interesting area of inquiry is in the connection between progressive political reform and the emergence of the social studies. For example,

at least four important members of the Social Studies Committee, William Dunn, James Lynn Barnard, F.W. Carrier, and Clarence Kingsley, were also members of the National Municipal League an organization dedicated to the improvement of urban life and education through the application of Progressive political ideals. Given the anti-immigrant and anti-working class orientation of many of the advocates of the municipal reform, the establishment of a connection between the ideals of the National Municipal League and work of the Social Studies Committee could be illuminating. We might be able to determine the extent to which the development of the social studies represented an attempt to use the schools for the inculcation of progressive ideals, thus developing a more effective and efficient mode of social control.

Another area of inquiry is in the relationship between the acceptance of Thorndikes findings in psychology and the social studies. Thorndike argued that transfer of training existed only within strict limits and that habits were specialized in their development. Thorndike's work then may have served to provide scientific justification for the endeavour of the Social Studies Committee (particularly in regard to the Problems of Democracy course) to provide instruction in terms of concrete social problems rather than historical situations.[64]

The connection between the work of the Social Studies Committee and the movement for industrial and vocational education also needs attention. At least six members of the Social Studies Committee were connected with industrial schools. Moreover,

some school administrators considered that the social studies constituted an especially appropriate study for the "submerged tenth" of high school students. If the connection with industrial education can be established, then the civic virtues the committee advocated might be understood as virtues most appropriate for industrial workers.

Finally, we need more research into the modern social studies in the light of their history. Particularly, we need to endeavour to understand how modern social studies curricula function to maintain the existing distribution of power and priviledge. Michael W. Apple, for instance,has demonstrated that some of our modern curriculum material in the social studies tacitly support a consential, evolutionary, view of the development and functioning of American society. The net effect of the use of these materials is to obscure for children the role of conflict in social progress, and present a distorted view of both historical and political development.[65] As Apple's findings are confirmed by further research, social studies educators will face a troublesome situation. We may have to confront the fact that we are continuing the practices of 1916 in 1976. The only difference might be that the modern version of the Social Studies is more effective because the indoctrination is more covert.

REFERENCES

1. I am indebted to Professor Michael W. Apple for suggesting this.

2. Michael F.D. Young, ed., Knowledge and Control (London; 1971), p.8.

3. Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School: 1880-1920 (Madison, 1969), p. 355.

4. Rolla M. Tyron, The Social Sciences as School Subjects (New York: 1935), pp. 399-401.

5. Thomas Jesse Jones, Essentials of Civilization (New York: 1929), pp. 4-10.

6. Krug, op. cit., pp. 353-54.

7. Thomas Jesse Jones, chairman, "Statement oi Chairman of the Committee on the Social Studies," Preliminary Statements by Chairman of Committees of the National Education Association on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (Washington 1913). Hereafter cited as "Preliminary Statement."

8. J. Lynn Barnard, F.W. Carrier, Arthur W. Dunn, and Clarence Kingsley, The Teaching of Community Civics. (Washington, 1915). Hereafter cited as "Community Civics Report."

9. Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, The Social Studies in Secondary Education (Washington, 1916).

10. Ibid., p. 6

11. Ibid., pp. 55-56

12. Thomas Jesse Jones, Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum (Hampton, Va., 1908), pp. 1-2.

13. Richard Hofstadler, Social Darwinism in American Thought (New York, 1957).

14. Thomas Jesse Jones, Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum, p. 4.

15. Ibid., p. 7.

16. Ibid., p. 6.

17. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

18. Ibid., p. 12.

19. Ibid., pp. 9-12.

20. Thomas Jesse Jones, "Progress in Negro Education", Report of the United States Commissioner of Education (Washington: 1912), I, pp. 245-46.

21. Thomas Jesse Jones, Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum, p. 10.

22. Ibid., p. 13.

23. Ibid., p. 15.

24. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

25. Ibid., p. 17.

26. Compare, for example, pages 25 and 26 of the Preliminary Statement with the section entitled "Government and the Public Welfare" in Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum.

27. Compare pages 54-55 of The Social Studies in Secondary Education with pages 43-44 in Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum.

28. Thomas Jesse Jones, Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum, p. 6.

29. Thomas Jesse Jones, Preliminary Statement pp. 16-17.

30. C.R.S.E. The Social Studies in Secondary Education, p. 16.

31. John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York, 1916) pp. 148-149. For a discussion of how Dewey's thought could have served to support the "Hampton Idea" see Walter Feinberg, Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of Twentieth Century Liberal Educational Policy (New York, 1975).

32. C.R.S.E., The Social Studies in Secondary Education, p.50.

33. W.E.B. DuBois, The Education of Black People: Ten Critiques, ed. by Herbert Aptheker (New York: 1973), pp. 6-7.

34. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

35. Atlanta Constitution, May 31, 1906. Also quoted in DuBois, op. cit., p. 12.

36. James Anderson, Education for Servitude: The Social Purpose of Schooling in the Black South, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1972.

37. Quoted in Walter Feinberg, op. cit., p. 115.

38. Albert Shaw "Learning by Doing at Hampton Institute", Review of Reviews (April 1900) p. 417.

39. Ibid., pp. 419-420.

40. Walter Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison, 1967), pp. 40-42.

41. David Snedden, "History as an Instrument in the Social Education of Children", Journal of Pedagogy (June, 1906) p. 261.

42. Drost, op. cit., p. 40.

43. Ibid.

44. G. Stanley Hall, Adolescence (New York; 1904) II, p.510.

45. "A Broader Education Needed" Banker's Magazine (Aug.1906), pp. 378-79.

46. Quoted in Krug, op. cit., pp. 178-179.

47. Ibid., p. 270.

48. William Chandler Bagley, The Educative Process (New York, 1905), p. 57-58.

49. Ibid., p. 60.

50. David Snedden, "History as an Instrument in the Social Education of Children," loc. cit. p. 263-64.

51. Education (Oct. 1911), p. 118.

52. Snedden loc. cit., pp. 265-66.

53. James Harvey Robinson, The New History (New York, 1922), p. 135.

54. Ibid., p. 139

55. C.R.S.E., The Social Studies in Secondary Education, pp. 50-51.

56. Robinson, op. cit., p. 140.

57. Ibid., p. 142.

58. Jones, Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum, pp. 6-7.

59. See Feinberg, op. cit., pp. 167-201, for further discussion of the role of history in advancing ideology.

60. Robinson, op. cit., p. vi

61. Community Civics Report, p. 24. See also the Social Studies in Secondary Education, pp. 26-29. Some of the "Our Working World" materials represent a modern version of this approach. See especially "Neighborhood Helpers" and "Community Helpers."

62. J. Lynn Barnard, "Training in the Schools for Civic Efficiency," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (1916), p. 27.

63. Community Civics Report, p. 23.

64. See particularly Edward L. Thorndike "Education for Initiative and Originality," Teacher's College Record (1916), pp. 405-16.

65. Michael W. Apple, "Conflict and the Hidden Curriculum" Interchange II (1971).